

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Curtis Reese et al.

Serial No.: 10/725,169

Filed: December 1, 2003

Docket No.: 100110834-1

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR REMOTE MANAGEMENT OF PRINTING DEVICES

REMARKS

The following Remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, in which claims 1-13 and 16-26 were rejected, and claims 14-15 were objected to.

With this Amendment, claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1-11 and 13-26, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, Scott Lund, during a telephonic interview conducted April 29, 2008, during which Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the disposition of the claims in the Office Action Summary as compared with the disposition of the claims in the Detailed Action. For example, in the Office Action Summary (Disposition of Claims), claims 14-15 were indicated as being objected to, whereas in the Detailed Action (Allowable Subject Matter), claims 15-16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Accordingly, the Examiner contended that the disposition of the claims in the Office Action Summary was correct, and noted that the disposition of the claims in the Allowable Subject Matter section of the Detailed Action was incorrect. More specifically, the Examiner recognized that claims 14-15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 and 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson US Patent No. 6,148,346.

With this Amendment, claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice. In addition, dependent claims 13, 16, and 17 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 14. The rejection of claims 12, 13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), therefore, is rendered moot.

With this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method includes "**determining that the printing device is a management-enabled**

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Curtis Reese et al.

Serial No.: 10/725,169

Filed: December 1, 2003

Docket No.: 100110834-1

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR REMOTE MANAGEMENT OF PRINTING DEVICES

printing device if the printing device has the browsing capability, and determining that the printing device is a non-management-enabled printing device if the printing device does not have the browsing capability," includes "accessing printing device management content related to the non-management-enabled printing device via a client device connected to the non-management-enabled printing device if the printing device does not have the browsing capability," includes "providing a user interface related to the printing device management content of the non-management-enabled printing device on the client device if the printing device does not have the browsing capability," and includes "obtaining the printing device management content including the native interfaces from the network site via the management-enabled printing device, and providing the user interface including the one or more user-selectable items each associated with a printing device management function to the client device from the management-enabled printing device if the printing device has the browsing capability."

With this Amendment, independent claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the computer-readable media contain computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the steps of "determining if a printing device is management-enabled, including determining that the printing device is management-enabled if the printing device has a browsing capability, and determining that the printing device is not management-enabled if the printing device does not have a browsing capability," if the printing device is management-enabled: "facilitating one or more printing device management functions of the printing device, including obtaining a user interface for the one or more printing device management functions from a network site via the printing device, and providing the user interface for the one or more printing device management functions to a client device from the printing device," and if the printing device is not management-enabled: "accessing printing device management content for the one or more printing device management functions of the printing device from the network site via the client device;" and "communicating with the printing device via low-level printing device native interfaces to carry out the one or more printing device management functions, the low-level printing device native interfaces being included in the printing device management content accessed from the network site via the client

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Curtis Reese et al.

Serial No.: 10/725,169

Filed: December 1, 2003

Docket No.: 100110834-1

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR REMOTE MANAGEMENT OF PRINTING DEVICES

device and providing access to printing device firmware of the printing device in a native language of the printing device."

With respect to the Hanson reference, Applicant submits that this reference does not disclose a method providing for a management-enabled printing device and a non-management-enabled printing device, as claimed in independent claim 1, and does not disclose computer-readable media providing for a printing device that is management-enabled and a printing device that is not management-enabled, as claimed in independent claim 18.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 18, and the dependent claims depending therefrom, are each patentably distinct from the Hanson reference and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-13 and 16-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1-11 and 13-26 be allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-16 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. *[As outlined above, Applicant notes that the indication of claims 15-16 as being objected to should instead indicate that claims 14-15 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.]*

Applicant agrees with the Examiner's conclusions regarding patentability without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the Examiner's reasoning. In particular, Applicant submits that the above-identified claims are allowable because the prior art fails to teach, anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of how the invention is paraphrased.

With this Amendment, Applicant has rewritten allowable claim 14 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 12) and any intervening claims (none). Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 13, 16, and 17 to depend directly or indirectly from rewritten independent claim 14. As rewritten claim 14 is now believed to be in allowable form, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 13, 15, 16, and 17

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Curtis Reese et al.

Serial No.: 10/725,169

Filed: December 1, 2003

Docket No.: 100110834-1

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR REMOTE MANAGEMENT OF PRINTING DEVICES

are allowable in dependent form. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the objection to claims 14-15 be withdrawn and that claims 13-17 be allowed.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Curtis Reese et al.

Serial No.: 10/725,169

Filed: December 1, 2003

Docket No.: 100110834-1

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR REMOTE MANAGEMENT OF PRINTING DEVICES

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-11 and 13-26 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan R. Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Curtis Reese et al.,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: MAY 1, 2008

SAL:hsf

/SCOTT LUND/

Scott A. Lund

Reg. No. 41,166